

**RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

**NOV 26 2007**

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re Application of: **Udayan Rajendra Kanade**

Application No.: **10/667,549**

Group Art Unit: **2109**

Filed: **September 22, 2003**

Examiner: **Wilser, Michael P**

Attorney Docket No.: **COT-002**

Title: **Method and System for Multithreaded Processing using Errands**

Honorable Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**AMENDMENT**

Sir:

Please enter the following amendment:


---

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited this date with the US Postal Service as first-class mail in an envelope addressed as below, or being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO at 571 273 8300, on the date set forth below.

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
PO Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dated On \_\_\_\_ November 26, 2007 \_\_\_\_

By   
(Signature)

#### **A. Introductory Comments**

Based on the amendments and remarks that follow, reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

This amendment is in response to the office action dated May 24, 2007. A request for a three month extension of time for response is also enclosed. When it was filed, this application contained 5 independent claims and 23 total claims. After this amendment, the application contains 5 independent claims and 20 total claims. It is requested that Deposit Account No. 502158 be charged for the claim fees required for the entry of this amendment. However, since no claims have been added, it is submitted that no claim fee is due.

In the office action, claim 4 was objected to due to a typographical error in the claim. Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter. Claims 16 and 20-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, as failing to invoke 35 U.S.C. 112 6<sup>th</sup> paragraph, for using "means-plus-function" language. Claims 1-2, 5-8, 13-15 and 20-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C 102(e). Finally, in the office action, claims 16-19 were rejected on the basis of obviousness under 35 U.S.C 103(a).

In response to the objections to the specification, the specification has been modified in the 'Amendments to the Specification' section, on the basis of the suggestions set forth in the office action.